APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/710,835	08/05/2004	Adam D. Dirstine	977.066US1	6749

21186   7590   09/19/2007
SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG & WOESSNER, P.A.
P.O. BOX 2938
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402

EXAMINER
HUYNH, THU V

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2178	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
09/19/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/710,835	DIRSTINE, ADAM D.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Thu V. Huynh	2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>28 June 2007</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>16-26 and 31-38</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>16-26, 31-38</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some *   c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>04/03/06</u>.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to communications: amendment filed on 06/28/07 to application

filed on 08/05/04.

2.   Claims 1-15 and 27-30 are canceled.

3.   Claims 16, 18, 31 are currently amended. Claims 36-38 are currently added.

4.   Claims 16-26, 31-38 are pending claims in this case. Claims 16 and 31 are dependent

claims.

5.   All the rejections in the previous office action have been withdrawn as necessitated by

the amendment.

Specification

6.   The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because the describe text of "XML document

processing module 350" (specification, [0028]) does not corresponding to figure number

(figure 3). Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on
sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

8.   **Claims 16, 21, 23-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by**

Cseri et al., US 2003/0046317 A1, filed 04/19/01.

Regarding independent claim 16, Cseri teaches a network device comprises:

- at least one processor (Cseri, fig.1; [0020]; personal and server computers);

- a network interface configured to communicate with the at least one processor and a

  network (Cseri, fig.1, [0020]; connecting to the Internet network);

- an XML document processing module, including a compression module configured

  to compress XML documents and to convert compressed XML document into text so

  as to form compressed valid XML documents (Cseri, [0014], [0020], [0063];

  compressing XML document by tokenizing the XML document to produce XML

  binary formatted document and converting the XML binary formatted document to

  XML document for displaying to a user computer).

Regarding claim 21, which is dependent on claim 16, Cseri teaches the network device

is an embedded device server operable to manage a remote device using XML documents (Cseri,

[0020]; server and client).

Regarding claim 23, which is dependent on claim 16, Cseri teaches the network

interface includes a web interface (Cseri, [0020]-[0021]; in order to transmit, access XML web

document in the Internet, the network interface must includes a web interface).

Regarding claim 24, which is dependent on claim 16, Sullivan teaches the network

interface is a wireless network (Cseri, [0021]).

Regarding claim 25, which is dependent on claim 24, Sullivan teaches the network

device is included in a cell phone (Cseri, [0020], [0115], hand-held devices, mobile phones).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

10.   **Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cseri as**

applied to claim 16 above, and further in view of Girardot et al., US 2003/0023628 A1, filed

04/09/01.

Regarding claim 17, which is dependent on claim 16, Sullivan does not explicitly

disclose the XML document processing module includes a deflate compression algorithm.

Girardot teaches deflate compression is popular used to compress a document (Girardot,

[0009]).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to have combined Girardot's teaching and Cseri's teaching to compress the

XML document using deflate compression algorithm, since the deflate compression is popular

one.

11.   **Claims 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over**

Cseri and Girardot as applied to claim 17 above, and further in view of **Tycksen, Jr.** et al.,

US 6,189,097 B1, filed 03/24/97.

Regarding claim 18, which is dependent on claim 17, Sceri does not explicitly teach

compression module includes a binary to ASCII text encoding algorithm.

Tycksen teaches converting binary data to ASCII text (Tycksen, col.9, lines 7-15).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to have combined Tycksen's teaching and Sceri's teaching to include a

binary to ASCII text encoding algorithm, since the combination allowed to convert the XML

binary data in to ASCII text in order to provide the XML document to the user.

Regarding claim 19, which is dependent on claim 18, Sullivan does not teaches the

binary to ASCII text encoding algorithm includes using base-64 encoding algorithm.

Tycksen teaches the binary to ASCII text encoding algorithm includes using base-64

encoding algorithm (Tycksen, col.9, lines 7-15).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to have combined Tycksen's teaching and Sceri's teaching to include a

binary to ASCII text encoding algorithm, since the combination allowed to convert the XML

binary data in to ASCII text in order to provide the XML document to the user.

12.   **Claims 20, 31-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over**

Cseri as applied to claim 16 above, and further in view of **Sullivan,** US 7,007,105 B1, filed

01/11/01

Regarding claim 20, which is dependent on claim 16, Cseri does not teaches XML document processing module includes a decompression module to decompress compressed valid XML document.

Sullivan teaches the XML document processing module includes a decompression module to decompress compressed valid XML document (Sullivan, fig.4; col.4, lines 64-66; decompressing a token XML document to XML document).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Sullivan's teaching and Cseri's teaching to include a decompressing module, since the combination would have recreated the XML from the token XML document.

Regarding independent claim 31, Cseri teaches the steps of:

- a communication network (Cseri, [0020], [0021]; communication network for connecting systems to the Internet network);

- at least first and second network devices to communicate over the network (Cseri, [0020], [0021]; the network device comprises personal computer, hand-held devices, server computers, main frames, etc., wherein each network device includes:

  o at least one processor (Cseri, [0020]);

  o a network interface to communicate with the at least one processor (Cseri, figure 1, [0020], [0021]).

  o an XML document processing module, wherein the XML document processing module includes:

- a compressing module configured to compress XML documents and to convert compressed XML documents into text so as to form compressed valid XML document (Cseri, [0014], [0020], [0063]; compressing XML document by tokenizing the XML document to produce XML binary formatted document and converting the XML binary formatted document to XML document for displaying to a user computer).

However, Cseri does not teaches XML document processing module includes a decompression module to decompress compressed valid XML document.

Sullivan teaches the XML document processing module includes a decompression module to decompress compressed valid XML document (Sullivan, fig.4; col.4, lines 64-66; decompressing a token XML document to recreate XML document).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Sullivan's teaching and Cseri's teaching to include a decompressing module, since the combination would have recreated the XML from the token XML document.

Regarding claim 32, which is dependent on claim 31, referring to rationale relied to reject claim 31, the limitation "the first network device is an embedded device server, the first network device operable to receive a device configuration file as a compressed valid XML document and decompress the document" is included. The rationale is incorporated herein.

Regarding claim 33, which is dependent on claim 31, Cseri teaches the first network

device is operable to transfer to a status message as a compressed valid XML document to the

second network device (Cseri, fig.3B, [0063]; a system sends the compressed XML document).

Regarding claim 35, which is dependent on claim 31, Cseri teaches the network is a

wireless communication network (Cseri, [0021]).

13.   **Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over**

Sceri as applied to claims 16 above, and further in view of Ma et al., US 2005/0063575 A1,

filed 09/22/03.

Regarding claim 22, which is dependent on claim 16, Sceri does not explicitly disclose

the network interface includes a serial port.

Ma teaches network interface includes a serial port (Ma, [0074]; a serial communication

network).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to have combined Ma's teaching and Sceri's teaching to include a serial

port, since the combination would have connected systems using many types of communication

network.

14.   **Claim 34 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over**

Sceri amd Sullivan as applied to claim 31 above, and further in view of Ma et al., US

2005/0063575 A1, filed 09/22/03.

Regarding claim 34, which is dependent on claim 31, Sceri teaches the network is wired

or wireless satellite network (Sceri, [0019], [0020]). However, Sceri teaches does not explicitly

disclose the network is a serial communication network.

Ma teaches network is a serial communication network (Ma, [0074]; serial wireless

network).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to have combined Ma's teaching and Sceri's teaching to include a serial

wireless network, since the combination would have connect system using many type of

communication network.

15.   **Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over**

Sceri as applied to claim 16 above, and further in view of Hsu et al., US 2004/0205158, filed

02/24/03.

Regarding claim 26, which is dependent on claim 16, Sceri teaches the network is a

wireless local area network (WLAN) (Sceri, [0019], [0020], network LAN and is wired or

wireless). However, Sceri does not explicitly disclose the network device is included in a

WLAN computer card.

Hsu teaches network device is included in a WLAN computer card (Hsu, [0093], laptop

includes WLAN card).

It would h have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to have combined Hsu's teaching into Sceri's teaching to include WLAN

computer card, since the combination would have connected systems using many type of

communication network.

Response to Arguments

16.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 16-26, 31-38 have been considered but are

moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicants argue with respect to claims 16 and 31 that Sullivan does not teach

"compressed valid XML document because, as stated in the present application, valid XML

document cannot contain binary data" (Remarks, page 6).

. However, Sceri teaches such limitation as explained in the rejection above.

Applicants argue with respect to claims 16 and 31 that Imaura does not teach compressed

valid XML document because XML data compressed using LZ77 that produces files contain

binary information (Remarks, page 9).

However, Sceri teaches such limitation as explained in the rejection above.

Conclusion

17.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this

Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this

final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Thu V. Huynh whose telephone number is (571) 272-4126. The

examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Stephen S. Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would

like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated

information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

TVH
September 11, 2007

STEPHEN HONG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER